

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

PART ONE

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
1	2004	<i>Phase II Douglas County [Nebraska] Drug Court Evaluation Report.</i> Thomas J. Martin, Cassia C. Spohn, R.K. Piper, and Jill Robinson	Recidivism and cost benefit study comparing criminal justice outcomes of offenders in drug court with offenders in County Attorney’s pre-trial diversion program and offenders in traditional adjudication	Drug court participants	offenders in County Attorney’s pre-trial diversion program and offenders in traditional adjudication
2	September 2004	<i>Participation in Drug Treatment Court and Time to Rearrest.</i> Duren Banks and Denise C. Gottfredson. <i>Justice Quarterly</i> . Vol. 21, no. 3, September 2004. Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences	Review of arrest history of 139 drug court and 96 control group defendants re arrests for two year period following assignment to drug court (drug court participants randomly assigned to drug court; control group was eligible but randomly assigned to nondrug court treatment)	139 drug court participants randomly assigned to drug court; and 96 control group was eligible but randomly assigned to nondrug court treatment)	96 control group defendants who were eligible for drug court but randomly assigned to nondrug court treatment
3	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Anne Arundel County, Maryland Drug Court. Prepared by: NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon</i>	Tracked sample (53) of Drug court participants who entered the drug court from 1997 – 1998 re recidivism and costs resulting	Sample (53) of drug court participants who entered drug court from 1997 -1998	Comparable defendants who did not enter the drug court during the same period
4	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland Drug Treatment Court: Includes Outcome Findings, Cost Analysis, and Summary and Conclusions, Only; Prepared by NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon</i>	Tracked sample of 60 drug court participants from 2000 and comparable sample of 63 offenders who did not enter the drug court for 3 year period to determine possible cost savings for justice system, victimization, and for other areas	Sample of 60 drug court participants who entered program in 2000 compared with comparable sample of 63 offenders who did not enter the drug court	Comparable defendants from 2000 who did not enter the drug court
5	January 2004	<i>Kalamazoo County 9th Judicial Circuit Court Office of Drug Treatment Court Programs: Statistical Report: 2003. Prepared January 2004</i> - Part One: Female Drug Court - Part Two: Male Drug court	Updates previous annual report with 2003 data to cover 543 female enrollees and 506 male enrollees since program began	543 female enrollees and 506 male enrollees in Kalamazoo Drug Court since its inception	n/a

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
6	January 2004	<i>Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002 and 200. Prepared by The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center.</i>	Review of data from 19 adult drug and DUI courts operating in 21 counties in Oklahoma, including drug court participant characteristics at time of program entry; compliance with Oklahoma Drug Court Statute; use of sanctions; outcome, recidivism and costs	1,666 participants in 19 drug courts during period July 2001 – June 2003.	(1) successful standard probation drug offenders; and (2) released inmates who had drug convictions;
7	October 2003	<i>The New York State Adult Drug Court Evaluation: Policies, Participants and Impacts.</i> Center for Court Innovation. New York, New York.	Reviews operations, recidivism and other impacts in the following nine drug courts: Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Rochester, Suffolk Co., and Syracuse	Studied post-arrest recidivism of drug court participants for 3 years (Bronx, Manhattan, Queens, and Suffolk) and 4 years (Brooklyn and Rochester), compared with reconviction rates of similar defendants not entering the drug court;	Similar defendants not entering drug court
8	August 1, 2003	<i>Drug Court More Beneficial for Women:</i> [author not provided]	Oklahoma female prison population Drug-Court Enrollments as of July 1, 2003	Oklahoma female drug court graduates	Oklahoma male drug court graduates
9	July 2003	<i>16th Judicial District of Tennessee (Rutherford Co.) Drug Court Program 2003 Process Evaluation.</i> Dana K. Fuller, Ph.D. July 2003	Studied 99 persons admitted to the program as of July 15, 2003	Studied 99 persons admitted to the program as of July 15, 2003	n/a – process evaluation with limited outcome data
10	June 1, 2003	<i>Recidivism Among Federal Probationers</i> Minor, Kevin; Wells, James; Sims, Crissy.	Individuals serving federal probation sentences in the Eastern District of Kentucky.	200 individuals sentenced from Federal Probation in the Eastern District of Kentucky between 1/96 and 6/99. Individuals were studied during a 2-year follow-up period between 1/96 and 6/99.	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
11	May 2003	<i>Coconino County DUI/DRUG Court Evaluation.</i> Prepared by: Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders, et. Al. Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University	Outcome data compiled May 1, 2001 – October 31, 2002 for Drug court participants and control group with similar characteristics and processed through traditional criminal justice system	Participants in DUI Drug Court during May 1, 2001-October 31, 2002	Randomly assigned eligible offenders with similar characteristics processed through traditional criminal justice system
12	April 18, 2003	<i>Assessing the Efficacy of Treatment Modalities in the Context of Adult Drug Courts.</i> Donald F. Anspach, Ph.D. and Andrew S. Ferguson.	Examines various issues relating to the delivery of treatment services in four drug court sites: Bakersfield, Cal; St. Mary Parish La.; Jackson Co., Mo.; and Creek Co., Okla.;	In addition to treatment and related staff, 2,357 offenders enrolled in the four programs between January 1997 and December 2000	n/a
13	April 15, 2003	<i>Bibb County Special Drug Court Program: Eight-Year Annual Report. April 15, 2003.</i> Prepared by Chief Judge Tommy Day Wilcox, Superior Courts, Macon Judicial Circuit and Jacqueline Duncan, Program Administrator	Review of program operations and analysis of graduates: 1994 – 2002	394 graduates of program from 1994 – 2002	n/a

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
14	March 2003	<i>Summary Report of Virginia's Drug Court Programs.</i> Office of the Supreme Court of Virginia and Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.	Individuals in the Virginia drug court program between November 1995 and December 2002 were analyzed.	1727 Virginians admitted to the felony drug court program	N/A
15	March 2003	<i>Washington State's Drug Courts for Adult Defendants: Outcome Evaluation and Cost-Benefit Analysis.</i> Washington State Institute for Public Policy	Presents statistical summary of other drug court studies in U.S.; describes Washington's outcome evaluation and cost-benefit analysis of the following 6 of Washington's adult drug courts (with implementation dates noted): King Co. (8/1/94); Pierce Col (10/11/94); Spokane Co. (1/1/95); Skagit Co. (4/1/97); Thurston Co. (5/1/98); and Kitsap Co. (2/1/99); and presents findings and recommendations (study conducted at direction of Washington Legislature)	Evaluated six adult drug courts in Washington operating during 1998 and 1999 to test whether Washington's drug courts reduce recidivism rates	Obtained individual-level data (gender, age, ethnicity, prior criminal history, and current offense) for defendants who entered drug court and, for four of the programs also obtained individual-level data for defendants screened for the drug court; then constructed comparison groups; used this information to construct comparison groups, using six different comparison groups and several sampling approaches, including: selecting cases filed in the same counties 2 years prior to start of drug court; selecting comparable cases from non-drug court counties filed at same time; tested drug court effectiveness using all six groups to provide a range of estimates for drug court outcomes

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
16	February 7, 2003	<i>Judicial Council of California. Administrative Office of the Courts. Report. Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Progress Report</i>	Evaluated cost and effectiveness of drug courts in state; Phase I: study of three courts	Participants who completed drug court	N/A; compared arrest rates two years following admission with arrest rates two years prior to admission
17	January 6, 2003	<i>Evaluating the Effectiveness of Drug Courts in Idaho: Report to Governor Dirk Kempthorne and the First Regular Session of the 57th Idaho Legislature.</i> Idaho Supreme Court	Review of developments of 30 drug courts in Idaho; data provided on participants in Districts 4 and 5 (6 programs with 206 participants)	6 programs in Districts 4 (Ada Co and Elmore Co.) and 5 (Mini-Cassia Minidoka Co and Twin Falls Co.)	n/a
18	January 2003	<i>Evaluating Treatment Drug Courts in Kansas City, Missouri and Pensacola, Florida: Final Reports for Phase I and Phase II.</i> Abt Associates. Prepared by Linda Truitt; Wm. Rhodes; N.G. Hoffman; Amy Maizell Seeherman; Sarah Kuck Jalbert; Michael Kane; Cassie P. Bacani; Kyla M. Carrigan; Peter Finn	Phase I: retrospective study of 1992-7 participants including case studies (process); and impact evaluation (survival analysis of recidivism); Phase II: study of 1999-2000 participants re program retention and participant perceptions	Phase I; 1992-7 and Phase II: 1999-2000 participants in Escambia County, Florida (74 participants) and Jackson County, Kansas (182 participants)	Phase I: Recidivism: Defendants with similar criminal histories arrested before drug court started and defendants with similar criminal histories arrested between 1993-7 who participated and did not participate in the drug court Phase II: n/a
19	May 5, 2002	<i>From Whether to How Drug Courts Work: Retrospective Evaluation of Drug Courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Multnomah County (Portland), [Oregon].</i> John S. Goldkamp; Michael D. White; Jennifer B. Robinson.	Tracks implementation and development of drug court in Portland, Oregon (1991-98) and Las Vegas, Nevada (1992-1998), focusing on outcomes and possible impact of various factors relating to structure, operation, and various innovations introduced in these programs	75 Drug court participants from each year since program inception in Portland (except 143 defendants for 1997); and 100 participants for each year in Las Vegas, and similar groups of defendants who didn't enter drug court and whose cases were disposed of through the traditional process.	Two groups of comparable defendants in each site whose cases were disposed of through the traditional process: (a): defendants who failed to attend first drug court appearance; and (b) defendants who attended first drug court appearance but failed to attend treatment

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
20	March 2002	<i>Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998. Final Report.</i> Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts.	Present results of evaluation of 34 drug courts operating under Drug Court Partnership Act to demonstrate cost effectiveness of program	34 drug courts operating under Drug Court Partnership Act	
21	October 2001	<i>Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behaviors, Costs, and Avoided Costs to Society. Prepared by TK Logan, William Hoyt and Carl Leukefeld. Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. University of Kentucky</i>	Outcome evaluation of drug court programs in Fayette, Jefferson and Warren Counties, Kentucky	Study of 745 drug court participants from three drug courts; studied graduates, program terminators and individuals assessed for the drug court but who did not enter	Individuals assessed for the drug court but did not enter
22	October 2000	<i>Tulsa County Adult Drug Court: Phase II Analysis.</i> Wright, David. O'Connell, Paul. Clymer, Bob. Simpson, Debbie.	Clients that had entered the Tulsa County Adult Drug Court Programs from 5/96 to 6/00.	117 adult non-violent felony offenders with substance abuse histories who had entered the drug court program were monitored from 5/96 to 6/00 within the Tulsa County Adult Drug Court system.	A sample of 113 individuals on probation was matched by criminal history and felony charge to the population studied.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
23	May 1999	<i>Evaluation of the Hennepin County [Minneapolis] Drug Court. Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice (R. Ericson; S. Welter and Thomas L. Johnson]</i>	Reviews program operations and outcomes of drug court participants during 1996-998 period; analyses treatment recidivism (readmission to new program after completing drug court treatment) and criminal recidivism (felony and gross misdemeanor charges and misdemeanor convictions occurring during 9 month follow up study period); also looked at employment status and improved parenting skills of participants while in program	Drug court participants whose cases were filed between August 1, 997 and December 31, 1997 (with certain stated exceptions)	past drug offenders prior to drug court program implementation with similar demographic characteristics
24	October 2000	<i>North Carolina Drug Treatment Court Evaluation Final Report. Craddock, Amy.</i>	Data was collected from 534 individuals attending 4 pilot drug court treatment programs in North Carolina, monitored 12 months after graduation	Individuals attending the pilot drug court treatment programs in North Carolina	Eligible drug court treatment applicants not admitted to the program
25	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000. O'Connell, Paul. Wright, David. Clymer, Bob.</i>	Individuals in the Oklahoma drug court program were monitored at 6, 9, 12, 18, and 24 months.	Oklahoma Drug Court Graduates	Probation offenders matched by criminal history and felony charge
26	October 2000	<i>1998 Drug Court Recidivism Report Update. Administrative Office of the Courts, Dade County (Miami), Florida</i>	Provides cumulative re-arrest rates for defendants who refused drug court, withdrew from drug court, and those who successfully completed probation.	Drug court graduates through 1998	Defendants who refused drug court withdrew from drug court, and those who successfully completed probation.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	Focus of Study	Population Studied	Comparison Group
27	January 2001	<i>Final Report on the Polk County Adult Drug Court: Executive Summary and Summary of Findings. Iowa Dept. of Human Rights. Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. Statistical Analysis Center.</i>	Study comparing clients entering program from its inception through September 30, 1998 with group of revoked probationers from FY96 and other offenders referred to the drug court who didn't enter	Drug court clients who entered program from inception through September 30, 1998	Group of revoked probationers from FY 96 and defendants who were referred to the drug court but didn't enter
28	July 2001	<i>NW HIDTA/DASA Washington State Drug Court Evaluation Project. G. Cox, L. Brown, C. Morgan, M. Hansten. Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute. University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.</i>	Study of drug court processes and outcomes in King County, Pierce Co;; Spokane Co; Thurston Co; Skagit Co; Kitsap Co; and Snohomish County; focus on examining organizational structure and operational characteristics of each program and impact of program on re-arrests; convictions, incarceration rates, earned income of participants, and utilization of public resources including medical, mental health, treatment and vocational services	Drug court participants in each site	
29	December 2004	<i>Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Court Programs. Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia</i>	Process and outcome evaluation of drug court participant retention rates and graduate and nongraduate (terminated or withdrawn) recidivism rates; also analysis of severity and tonicity of offenses committed by participants prior to drug court entry to address the issue: are drug courts accepting only "light weight" offenders? Or more serious and chronic offenders?	3,216 adult felony Drug court participants admitted to the drug courts between November 1995 and December 2004, consisting of 2,002 graduates or current enrollees	Adult drug offenders studied by Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission (VCSC) in 1999 for recidivism rates and severity of offense history

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

PART TWO

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
1	2004		<p>Offenders assigned to drug court significantly less likely to be rearrested than offenders who go through traditional adjudication (including felony arrests)</p> <p>Offenders assigned to drug court more likely to be rearrested than offenders in pretrial diversion (including felony arrests) <u>–[NOTE: pretrial diversion is for lower risk offenders]</u></p>	n/a	n/a
2	September 2004	Survival analysis of 139 drug court participants and 96 defendants eligible for drug court but randomly assigned to non drug court program	<p>-A significantly greater proportion of the drug court sample (33%) survived throughout the follow up period compared with less than one fifth of the control sample (18%)</p> <p>-both samples experienced their sharpest decline between months 0 and 4 when each lost about one third of its members to failure (e.g., arrest).</p> <p>- half of the control sample failed by 5.1 months while the drug court sample did not lose half of its members until 11.1 months</p> <p>- drug court sample members who had greater exposure to the drug court components of drug treatment, drug testing, and status hearings were rearrested significantly less often than those with less exposure to these components.</p>		24 months from time of program entry
3	January 29, 2004	Tracked sample of drug court participants (53) in District Court and comparable group of non drug court participants for recidivism and costs and possible cost savings resulting	<p>Over 4 year period, drug court participants had 12.3% fewer arrests than comparison group;</p> <p>PROPERTY OFFENSES: Drug court participants had 18.8% fewer arrests for property crime than comparison group;</p> <p>CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS: Drug court participants had 73.3% fewer arrests for crimes against persons than comparison group, so that victimization costs (e.g., medical costs, lost time from work, etc.) were substantially reduced;</p> <p>nongraduates had 1.17</p>		Four years following program entry

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
4	January 29, 2004	Tracked sample of drug court participants (60) in Circuit and District Courts and comparable group of (63) non drug court participants for recidivism and resultant costs and possible cost savings resulting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over 3 year period, drug court participants had 31.4% fewer arrests overall than comparison group (Circuit Court participants had 44.2% fewer arrests); - DRUG OFFENSES: Drug court participants had 35.3% fewer arrests than comparison group (62.3% fewer arrests for Circuit Court participants); -PROPERTY OFFENSES: Drug court participants had 68.8% fewer arrests for property crimes than comparison group (71.9% fewer arrests for Circuit Court participants) -CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS: drug court participants had 48% fewer crimes against person than comparison group (Circuit Court participants had 70% fewer), with resultant reductions in victimization costs (medical expenses, lost pay, etc.) as well as criminal justice system costs 		3 years following program entry
5	January 2004	Updated previous annual report to follow 543 female enrollees since program inception			
6	January 2004	N/A		Of 425 drug court graduates, 8 (1.9% recidivated*; of 3,405 successful standard probation offenders, 113 (3.3% recidivated); of 3,334 released inmates, 262 (7.9%) recidivated. Drug court graduates almost 2 times (73.7%) less likely to recidivate* than successful standard probation offenders; Drug Court graduates over 4 times (315.8%) less likely to recidivate than released <u>prison inmates</u> *recidivate: defined as offender becoming incarcerated in prison	First year following graduation

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
7	October 2003	Follows drug court participants in six NY programs and compares with similar defendants not entering drug court	(1) Recidivism reductions ranged from 13% to 47%, with average of 29% (2) (post program recidivism reduction from 19% to 52% (average is 32%))		(1)Following arrest (2) following program
8	August 1, 2003	N/A	-Women 14.2% -Men 21.4%	N/A	Within 36 months of graduating from drug court
9	July 2003	Process evaluation of 99 participants admitted to the program as of July 15, 2003	21% of participants admitted to program arrested while enrolled; 8% of 36 graduates arrested after graduation		December 2000 – July 2003
10	June 1, 2003	N/A	-30.5% had violated sentences within 2 years of being placed on probation.	N/A	N/A
11	May 2003	Process and outcome evaluation of 57 DUI drug court participants and 42 control group randomly assigned defendants with similar characteristics whose cases were processed in the traditional process	.01 offenses for DUI Drug Court participants compared with .03 for control group also: number of positive drug tests: - DUI drug court participants: 4% (6.1 average taken per month) - Control group: 18% (1 average taken per month)	n/a	18 months
12	April 18, 2003	Obtained re-arrest data for each of 2,357 participants in 4 drug courts studied for 12 months following discharge from program	Overall: - 9% rearrests for graduates; rearrests took average of 6.6 mos; - 41% rearrest for unsuccessful terminations; rearrests took average of 5.6 mos. Specific Programs: (p.9-4) -Bakersfield, Cal: 13%-grads; 53% terminated; St. Mary Parish, La.: 6%-graduates; 22%-terminated; Jackson Co., Mo.: 7%: grads; Creek Co., Okl: 20%	N/A	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
13	April 15, 2003	Review of rearrests for participants and graduates: 1994 - 2002	Participants: total rearrests were 140 (10.14%) of 1,380 participants	28 (7.11% of 394 graduates were convicted of offenses following graduation	N/A
14	March 2003	N/A	Felony -avg. 5.9% (0-12%) Misdemeanor -avg 10.1% (0-14.3 %) Recidivism defined as re-arrest.	N/A	N/A
15	March 2003	Using six different comparison groups, measured recidivism rates (criminal convictions for new offenses) of drug court; pooled smaller counties (Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane and Thurston) and analyzed King and Pierce separately because they were larger		In all counties except King Co., drug court reduced felony recidivism rates by 13%; 8 year felony reconviction rate is 45.8% for nondrug court participants and 39.9% for drug court participants. King Co. didn't reduce recidivism, with high rate of terminations for 1998-1999. Also found that this 13% reduction in recidivism was consistent with recidivism reductions reported in 30 drug court evaluations reviewed for other jurisdictions.	Maximum of eight years
16	February 7, 2003	Studied arrest rates, compiled from 17 counties for 1,945 participants who completed one of 3 drug courts in state	Declined by 85% in first two years after admission compared to two years prior to entry	Declined by 77% in two years following admission compared to two years prior to entry	Two years following entry
17	January 6, 2003	Statistical data on convictions of graduates after leaving program		Conviction rate for graduates was 11%	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
18	January 2003	Ph. I: case studies to document program dev, policies and procedures, lessons learned; and impact evaluation using survival analysis to measure recidivism Ph. II: program retention model using logistic regression to predict program status, and survival analysis to predict length of stay; and descriptive analyses (Escambia County) using court records and interviews re participant perceptions	(definition of recidivism as rearrests implied from discussion) <u>Escambia Co.</u> : drug court participation reduced recidivism for new felonies from roughly 40% to nearly 12% within two year follow-up period. (less impact if <u>any</u> rearrest is considered)- drug court reduced recidivism for felonies but not new misdemeanor arrests; males had higher probability of recidivism than females; blacks had higher probability of recidivism than whites; recidivism rates decreased with age; offenders more likely to recidivate if they had more serious criminal records; timing of recidivism not affected by drug court participation <u>Jackson County</u> : probability for recidivism fell and time to rearrest increased with drug court participation; drug court participation reduced recidivism from approximately 50% to 35% for both felonies and misdemeanors; probability of eventually recidivating fell with drug court participation and time to rearrest increased. Participation reduced recidivism for new felonies or misdemeanors from 65% to 45%.; recidivism rates same for men and women but higher for blacks than for whites; recidivism rates dropped as age increased and rose for offenders with more serious criminal r records		24 months (implied from date of arrest)

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
19	May 5, 2002	Obtained rearrest data for group of drug court participants at each site from date of program inception through 1998 and rearrest data for comparison group of defendants	<p>Portland: 1991-97 Dr. Ct. partics: 37.4% rearrest at 1 year, compared with non drug court defendants group A (never appeared at first hearing) 53.3% and B (appeared at first hearing but not at treatment) 50.8%; 46.4% of drug ct partics rearrested after 2 yrs compared with 57.8% and 59% of comparison groups; 49.9% of drug ct partics rearrested after 3 years compared with 60.1% and 60.3% of nondrug court defs.</p> <p>Las Vegas: 1993-97: -52% drug court partics compared with 65% of compare group rearrested after one year; 62% of drug court partics vs. 74% of nondrug court arrested after 2 years; 65% of drug court partics vs. 79% of nondrug court defs rearrested after 3 years.</p>		3 years
20	March 2002		A substantial number of drug court participants (approximately 3,0090) completed drug court during the study period; participants who completed drug court as compared to aggregate of all entering participants during study period, had very low rearrest, conviction and incarceration rates for the two years after admission to drug court. Arrest rate for participants who completed drug court is 85% less during the two years after admission than arrest rate for those entering program during the two year p rior to entry	Conviction rate for participants who competed drug court is 77% less during two years after admission than conviction rate of those entering program during the two years prior to entry;	2 years following drug court admission
21	October 2001	Studied client files, local jail and prison data; NCIC data, child support collections, traffic accidents, mental health service utilization , employment data and random interviews of drug court graduates and terminators		12 months following graduation, graduates less likely to have had felony or misdemeanor conviction, or been in prison or jail; graduates had significantly more days to first misdemeanor charge but significantly fewer days to first felony charge than other groups (terminators and nonentry defendants)	12 months after graduation or termination

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
22	October 2000	Individuals were tracked with rap sheets in order to produce results.	6 months -6% DC -7% Comp. 12 months -9% DC -21% Comp. 18 months -10% DC -26% Comp. 24 months -11% DC -27% Comp. = 11% recidivism rate Recidivism was defined as any contact with the law.	N/A	At 6,12,18, and 24 months after release
23	May 1999	Tracked drug court cases filed between August 1, 1997 0- December 31, 1997 and predrug court comparison group for 9 month period; compiled data on offender characteristics, prior conviction history; length of case; reoffenses; and nature of drug addiction (for drug court participants only)	Drug court and predrug court defendants had similar recidivism rates	Drug court and predrug court defendants had similar recidivism rates	9 months following case filing
24	October 2000	Research compared DTC and non-DTC drug offenders	12 months -18% graduates -41% non-graduates -44% comp.	N/A	12 months after graduation
25	October 2000	N/A	6 months: -6% DC; -6% comp. 12 months: -10% DC; -14% comp. 18 months: -11% DC; -22% comp. 24 months: -14% DC; -22% comp. Recidivism was defined as re-arrest	N/A	N/A

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Methodology	Recidivism Results		
			Re-Arrests	Convictions	Time Followed
25	October 2000	N/A	Those Refusing Drug Court: - 19.91% Those Who Withdrew From Drug Court: - 25.2% Successful Probationers: - 15.9% 1998 average for DC graduates: - 10.6%	N/A	N/A
27	January 2001	Tracked information re drug court participants and comparison group members re recidivism; completion rates; justice system and treatment costs	(recidivism not defined): drug court graduates had lower total post program recidivism than comparison groups	Post program recidivism rate for graduates after 416 days follow up was 28%, with only one of the 15 convictions a felony; 85% of the new convictions were for misdemeanors; 40% drug court clients were convicted of crimes post program; 62% of the men entering the drug court were convicted of new crimes while only 33% of the women were convicted;	n/a
28	July 2001	Conducted interviews of program officials and tracked data on participants at each site; divided subjects into five outcome groups: ineligible; opt outs; did not finish; graduates; and active cases	Graduates have fewer re-arrests than any of the other outcome groups	Offenders who graduate from drug court less likely than offenders in any other group to be reconvicted in the three years following referral to drug court	Three years following referral to drug court
29	December 2004		Of 647 graduates of adult drug courts, 103 have been rearrested for felony offenses after graduation (15.9% recidivism rate); 59 graduates had misdemeanor arrests (9.1% recidivism rate); Of 2,056 nongraduates, 303 were arrested for felony offenses after leaving drug court (33% recidivism rate) and 72 were arrested for misdemeanors (7.8%). Felony recidivism rate of drug offenders studied by Va. Criminal Sentencing Commission (VCSC) in 1999, was 50% -- significantly higher than felony recidivism rate for graduates or nongraduates	n/a	n/a

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

PART THREE

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
1	2004	<i>Phase II Douglas County [Nebraska] Drug Court Evaluation Report.</i> Thomas J. Martin, Cassia C. Spohn, R.K. Piper, and Jill Robinson	Drug court results in average savings of over \$ 4,000 per felony drug-related case compared with traditional adjudication and sentencing; savings mainly attributable to reduced jail confinement, prison incarceration costs, and county and district court processing costs (e.g., police overtime costs for court testimony);	
2	September 2004	<i>Participation in Drug Treatment Court and Time to Rearrest.</i> Duren Banks and Denise C. Gottfredson. <i>Justice Quarterly.</i> Vol. 21, no. 3, September 2004. Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences	None noted	None noted
3	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Anne Arundel County, Maryland Drug Court.</i> Prepared by: NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon	\$ 2,571,894 less in Drug Treatment Court criminal justice system costs than comparison group for all participants studied, or 32.4% return on investment; Average cost per participant was \$ 2,109; average savings resulting from criminal justice system savings, victimization costs and income tax payment experience of participants was \$ 3,651; savings represent a \$ 1.74 return for every dollar spent for the program.	
4	January 29, 2004	<i>Cost Analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland Drug Treatment Court: Includes Outcome Findings, Cost Analysis, and Summary and Conclusions, Only;</i> Prepared by NPC Research, Inc., Portland, Oregon	Average of \$ 3,393 (24.2%) per person less in criminal justice system costs per participant than comparison group (30.9% less costs for Circuit Court participants); projected for all 758 drug court participants during the study period resulted in a savings of \$ 2,721, 894 total costs for criminal justice system expenses over 3 year study period; \$ 9,817 average savings in victimization costs than for comparison group; projected for all 758 drug court participants results in \$ 7,442,044 savings in victimization costs for 3 year period; \$ 3,000 less per person in criminal justice system costs by end of first year than for comparison group; \$ 3,791 saved for each participant (\$ 14,271 cost for traditional process - \$ 10,480 cost for drug court),	

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			or 136.2% "return" on investment	
5	January 2004	<i>Kalamazoo County 9th Judicial Circuit Court Office of Drug Treatment Court Programs: Statistical Report: 2003. Prepared January 2004</i>	During CY 2003: FEMALES: - restitution paid to victims totaled \$ 7,215.25 - urine screen fees totaled \$ 8,000 - drug treatment court fees totaled \$ 5,150 MALES: - paid restitution to victims of \$ 4,891.15 - paid urine screen fees totaling \$ 10,080 - paid drug treatment court fees totaling \$ 13,410.	Women: 187 of 543 women successfully completed program 24 women still active in Phase I; 23 completed Phase I and in Phases 2 and 3 12 women on bench warrants; 36 women opted out of program 261 terminated for failure to perform of the 1887 who completed program, all were employed or attending school full time upon completion 16% (29) of 187 women who completed program were rearrested on new misdemeanor or felony charge within 3 years of program completion;; 84% (158) have had no subsequent convictions within 3 years of program completion Male: 160 of 506 men have successfully completed program 48 active in Phase I; 42 active in Phases 2-3 8 men on bench warrant status 33 men opted out of program 215 men terminated for failure to perform 15% (24) of 160 men graduates convicted of new misdemeanor or felony within 3 years of program completion; 85% (136) had no subsequent convictions within 3 years of program completion.
6	January 2004	<i>Oklahoma Drug Courts: Fiscal Years 2002 and 200. Prepared by The Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center.</i>	(1) If all 1,666 drug court participants studied would have served prison sentence, overall 4-year cost savings vs drug court vs prison was: \$ 45,552,798; (2) if all 1,666 drug court participants would have served standard probation sentences, 4-year costs of drug court were \$ 4,334,599 more than costs for standard probation	For Graduates: (1) 75.1% decrease in unemployment (reduced from (3) 50.4% increase in monthly income (from \$ 949.14 to \$ 1,426.55) (4) 13.6% decrease in percent of graduates without high school diploma (from 30.8% to 26.6%) (5) 19.1% increase in no. of graduates who had children living with them (from 120 (41.4%) to 143 (49.3%) (6) improvement in each of 7 components of ASI: - Medical: 56.3% decrease - Employment/Support: 71.4% decrease - Alcohol: 65.5% decrease - Drug: 65.5% decrease - Legal: 73.2% decrease - Family/Social: 68.6% decrease - psychiatric; 85% decrease
7	October 2003	<i>The New York State Adult Drug Court Evaluation:</i>	-Graduates significantly more likely to be employed at time of program completion	General: -Positive long-term impact persisted beyond period of active judicial supervision;

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>Policies, Participants and Impacts.</i> Center for Court Innovation. New York, New York.	-graduates in 5 of 9 programs significantly more likely to be attending school at time of program completion -some graduates of each court regained custody or visitation rights with their children; -some graduates of each court were volunteering in community at time of graduation, although no court mandated	-Drug court graduates were FAR less likely than comparison defendants to recidivate in all six courts; however drug court failures were as likely, if not more so, as comparison defendants to recidivate in four of the six courts; therefore, benefits of drug court participation largely accrue to those who successfully graduate; - <u>Predictors of recidivism:</u> -those with prior misdemeanor convictions and of younger age generally more likely than others to recidivate; - graduation less likely if primary drug was heroin (2 of 3 courts studied); - participants with property charges somewhat more likely to recidivate than those with drug charges - immediate engagement in treatment strongly predicted graduation - drug court graduation is key predictor of success (rather than length of time in treatment, etc.) - retention rates exceed national standard of 60% for 8 of 11 drug courts more than half of participants in 8 of 11 NY courts retained for at least 2 years (e.g., still participating or graduated)
8	August 1, 2003	<i>Drug Court More Beneficial for Women:</i> [author not provided]	N/A	Monthly income of female drug-court graduates increased 130%. Monthly income of male drug-court graduates increased 31% despite prior higher income and rate of employment. Oklahoma sends more women to prison than any other state in the nation.
9	July 2003	<i>16th Judicial District of Tennessee (Rutherford Co.) Drug Court Program 2003 Process Evaluation. Dana K. Fuller, Ph.D. July 2003</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% of participants who did not have GED obtained GED while in drug court • four babies born drug free • 8% of 36 graduates employed at graduation
10	June 1, 2003	<i>Recidivism Among Federal Probationers</i> Minor, Kevin; Wells, James; Sims, Crissy.	N/A	Individuals who were not ordered to community service or individuals who underwent mental health treatment were more likely to violate their sentences. Over 56% had 1 violation. Over 80% had no more than 2 violations.
11	May 2003	<i>Coconino County DUI/DRUG Court Evaluation.</i> Prepared by: Frederic I. Solop, Nancy A. Wonders, et. Al. Social Research Laboratory, Northern Arizona University	Average DUI drug court participant costs county approximately \$ 534/mo; average cost for traditional cjs processing is \$ 758/mo. (difference in cost primarily due to increased likelihood of control group members spending time in jail (\$80/day) or prison (\$ 53/day); total program costs were \$ 6,408 for DUI drug court (completed in 12 months) vs. \$ 22,740 for traditional process(requiring 2-3 years)	DUI Drug court participants averaged 6.7 treatment days/mo (compared with 1.2 for control group); worked more hours (32.1 hrs vs 29.8 hrs)/mo; and attended school more frequently (1.3 hrs/week vs. 0 hrs. for control group); and paid more money to the court each month (\$ 28.86vs. 7.34)

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
12	April 18, 2003	<i>Assessing the Efficacy of Treatment Modalities in the Context of Adult Drug Courts.</i> Donald F. Anspach, Ph.D. and Andrew S. Ferguson.	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - program completion is most consistent variable associated with post program recidivism; (both in terms of frequency of and time to rearrest); - other factors associated with post program recidivism included: treatment attendance (partics with low attendance at treatment had greater likelihood of being arrested); race/ethnicity, with race and ethnic minorities more likely than white non-Hispanics to be arrested; and age at first arrest (participants with prior arrests at younger ages more likely to be rearrested); gender (males more likely to be rearrested); [numerous other findings re non-recidivism issues]
13	April 15, 2003	<i>Bibb County Special Drug Court Program: Eight-Year Annual Report. April 15, 2003.</i> Prepared by Chief Judge Tommy Day Wilcox, Superior Courts, Macon Judicial Circuit and Jacqueline Duncan, Program Administrator	Estimated cost savings from jail time saved, both pre and post entry; other savings for law enforcement and defense (see “Cost Savings Memo”).	Other information relating to employment, and other program impacts
14	March 2003	<i>Summary Report of Virginia’s Drug Court Programs.</i> Office of the Supreme Court of Virginia and Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services.	Program saved \$5,487,330 in avoided incarceration for 303 graduates. Program saved \$33,000,000 in the birth of 44 drug-free babies. Cost benefits of individual courts are shown.	Recidivism rates for the individual drug courts are shown. The specifics of the recidivism rates are also shown.
15	March 2003	<i>Washington State’s Drug Courts for Adult Defendants: Outcome Evaluation and Cost-Benefit Analysis.</i> Washington State Institute for Public Policy	Drug courts are more expensive to operate than regular criminal courts (e.g., \$ 3,891 more per participant); overall, drug courts produce more benefits than costs:...”We found that the five adult drug courts generate \$ 1.74 in benefits for each dollar of costs.	Not studied
16	February 7, 2003	<i>Judicial Council of California. Administrative Office of the Courts. Report. Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Progress</i>	Avoided criminal justice costs averaged approximately \$ 200,000 annually per court for each 100 participants; with 90 adult drug courts operating statewide as of 2002, and drug court caseloads conservatively estimated at 100 participants per year, annual statewide cost savings for adult drug courts suggested by data to be \$ 18 million per	Social outcome data, compiled from 28 counties for 2,892 participants, indicated that 70% f participants were employed upon completion of drug court compared with 62% unemployed at entry; 96% of drug tests were negative; 96% of babies born to program participants (132 babies) were born drug free;

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>Report</i>	year; cost offset and cost avoidance estimated at \$ 43 million predominately due to avoided jail and prison costs; with \$ 1 million in cost offset due to collection of fees/fines.	
17	January 6, 2003	<i>Evaluating the Effectiveness of Drug Courts in Idaho: Report to Governor Dirk Kempthorne and the First Regular Session of the 57th Idaho Legislature. Idaho Supreme Court</i>	N/A	86% of participants gained or maintained employment 23% of graduates returned to school for GED or college average hourly wage rate increase of graduates was: \$ 4.89 average annual wage increase for graduates was: \$ 10,748.84
18	January 2003	<i>Evaluating Treatment Drug Courts in Kansas City, Missouri and Pensacola, Florida: Final Reports for Phase I and Phase II. Abt Associates. Linda Truitt; Wm. Rhodes; N.G. Hoffman; Amy Maizell Seeherman; Sarah Kuck Jalbert; Michael Kane; Cassie P. Bacani; Kyla M. Carrigan; Peter Finn Carrigan; Peter Finn.</i>		As of September 2001, 28% of Jackson Co participants and 49% of Escambia Co. participants entering drug court between October 1999 and October 2000 had successfully completed and graduated the drug court; participants required up to 22 months to complete program but median length of stay for graduates was 13 months (Jackson Co. (and 12 months (Escambia Co); median length of stay for terminations was 7.5 months (Jackson Co.) and 8 months (Escambia Co.); 17% of participants (Jackson Co.) and 11% (Escambia Co.) absconded; median length of stay for absconders was 6 months (Jackson Co.) and 4 months (Escambia Co.); <u>Predictors of program success:</u> Jackson Co.: Probability of program success increased with age, education and employment. Males, blacks and participants who owned or rented homes more likely to be unsuccessful. Participants who injected drugs was only AOD use variable correlated with unsuccessful program completion. Participants with emotional problems or prior treatment experience had higher probability of success; participants who scored low on problem recognition factor of treatment motivation had higher probability of success; Escambia Co.: similar findings except males and participants who owned or rented homes had higher probability of success; males nearly 3 x more likely to graduate or remain active than females; participants who had previously been in detox or rehab and participants with high levels of drug dependency more likely to be unsuccessful. Three of the four treatment motivation factors (problem recognition, treatment readiness, and external pressures) associated with higher probability of successful program participation.
19	May 5, 2002	<i>From Whether to How Drug Courts Work: Retrospective Evaluation of Drug Courts in Clark County (Las Vegas) and Multnomah County</i>	NA	Extensive discussion of various possible factors, both internal and external to the drug court program, that might impact recidivism rates.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
		<i>(Portland), [Oregon].</i> John S. Goldkamp; Michael D. White; Jennifer B. Robinson.		
20	March 2002	<i>Drug Court Partnership Act of 1998, Chapter 1007, Statutes of 1998. Final Report.</i> Prepared by The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts.	Total of 425,014 jail days avoided with an averted cost of approximately \$ 26 million; total of 227,894 prison days avoided, with an averted cost of approximately \$ 16 million; participants who completed paid almost \$ 1 million in fees and fines imposed by the court Fourteen million dollars in DCP program funds, combined with other funds supporting the programs, allowed cost offset and avoidance of approximately \$ 43 million.	Participants had long histories of drug use and multiple incarceration as well as serious social difficulties including homelessness, unemployment and limited education; more than 70% used drugs for 5 or more years with more than 40% using drugs for more than 10 years prior to entering drug court; 52% had a high school diploma or its equivalent and 13% had any college education; 62% were unemployed; on average each participant had been arrested twice and had one incident of conviction and incarceration in the two years prior to entering drug court; 70% of graduates employed at graduation; 11% obtained GED/high school diploma; 8% obtained vocational certificate and 1% of graduates completed college 12% of graduates transitioned from homelessness to housing 20% of graduates obtained drivers licenses and car insurance; 28% of graduates retained/regained custody of their children; 7% gained child visitation rights and 8% became current in child support payments; 31% were reunited with families; 95% of all babies born while mothers participated in drug court were drug-free; Incarceration rates for participants who completed drug court is 83% less during two years after admission than incarceration rate of those entering program during two years prior to entry While in drug court, participants engaged in low levels of drug use as indicated by high rates of negative urinalysis in comparison to prior drug use histories; Participants who successfully completed program improved substantially in all areas, showed decreased drug use and rearrests as well as improvement in employment and education; other areas of social functioning also improved including acquisition of stable housing and increased family involvement;
21	October 2001	<i>Kentucky Drug Court Outcome Evaluation: Behaviors, Costs, and Avoided Costs to Society.</i> Prepared by TK Logan, William Hoyt and Carl Leukefeld. Center on Drug and Alcohol Research. University of Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual cost of a drug court graduate (\$ 2,642 accounting cost and \$ 4,140 accounting and opportunity (e.g., judge, police, jail, etc.) costs is much less than the annual cost of housing an individual in jail (\$ 9,600) or prison (\$ 14,691) and not much higher than the annual cost of supervising an individual on probation (\$ 1,237) in Kentucky; total avoided costs of “benefits” for graduates is estimated to be \$ 4,364,114 when earnings are considered, and \$ 2,584,562 without 	Results for terminators were less pronounced than for the graduates. However, for most outcome measures, there does seem to be a gain...reductions in undesirable behavior and increases in desirable behavior, except for time in prison and child support deficits.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
			<p>the earnings for a one year period...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For every dollar spent on a drug court graduate, there was an avoided cost savings of \$ 3.30 to \$ 5.58 per graduate in a one year period when only accounting costs were considered, and a cost savings of \$ 2.11 to \$ 3.546 per graduate in a one year period when opportunity costs were included.; • When both graduates and terminators were included there is an estimated savings of \$ 6,199 per client when earnings were included, and a savings of \$3,059 in a one year period without the earnings per client using accounting costs. When the opportunity costs for Drug Court program graduates and terminators combined were used, there was an estimated savings of \$ 4,826 per participant when earnings were included, and a savings of \$ 1,686 per participant without the earnings in a one year period. • For every dollar spent on a drug court participant (graduates and terminators) there was an avoided cost savings of \$ 2.26 to \$ 3.56 per participant in a one year period when only accounting costs were considered, and a cost savings of \$ 1.44 to \$ 2.27 per participant in a one year period when opportunity costs were included. 	
22	October 2000	<i>Tulsa County Adult Drug Court: Phase II Analysis.</i> Wright, David. O'Connell, Paul. Clymer, Bob. Simpson, Debbie.	N/A	Re-arrest rates overestimate the actual level of criminality, while re-conviction rates underestimate the level of criminal activity.
23	May 1999	<i>Evaluation of the Hennepin County {Minneapolis} Drug Court.</i> Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice (R. Ericson; S. Welter and Thomas L. Johnson	Drug court handled 31% of all felony cases filed in 1997 in Hennepin Co, with primarily one judicial officer and various clerical staff; previously, this workload had been spread across all judges of the Court; Given the increase in case processing speed achieved by the Drug court, the increase in judicial efficiency is readily apparent	Efficiencies in case processing achieved: average number of appearances was 3 (roughly half of the previous average); treatment completion rates were higher than other clients (54.5% vs. ;47.3%);as
24	October	<i>North Carolina Drug</i>	N/A	Most important predictor of recidivism is DTC graduation.

**Recidivism and Other Findings Reported in Selected Evaluation Reports of Adult
Drug Court Programs Published: 2000 – Present**

#	Publication Date	Bibliographic Information	System Impact/Cost Savings	Other Findings
	2000	<i>Treatment Court Evaluation Final Report.</i> Craddock, Amy.		Most common drug used is cocaine. 98.6% of participants are chemically dependent.
25	October 2000	<i>Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000.</i> O'Connell, Paul. Wright, David. Clymer, Bob.	NA	Drug court participants are more likely to be successful if they are older, Caucasian, better educated, employed, and less criminally active. Drug court participants are less likely to be successful if they are relatively young, African American, less educated, unemployed, and more criminally active.
26	October 2000	<i>1998 Drug Court Recidivism Report Update.</i> Administrative Office of the Courts, Dade County (Miami), Florida	NA	Other data that supports finding that drug court reduces recidivism
27	January 2001	<i>Final Report on the Polk County Adult Drug Court: Executive Summary and Summary of Findings.</i> Iowa Dept. of Human Rights. Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. Statistical Analysis Center.	Total correction system costs for drug court clients (\$26,021.59) was less than for comparison group(\$29,427.80) or referred group (\$ 39,776.75).; treatment costs were \$ 5,149 per client compared to \$ 3,949 for referred group;	Of the 134 drug court client sin the study, 44% graduated; graduation rate has risen during program's first 2 years to 50%; most of terminations due to noncompliance rather than new arrests; Graduation rates for white and nonwhite clients are disparate; nonwhite clients have achieved very low rates of completion of the drug court; graduation rate for methamphetamine addicts was markedly higher than for participants using marijuana or cocaine
28	July 2001	<i>NW HIDTA/DASA Washington State Drug Court Evaluation Project.</i> G. Cox, L. Brown, C. Morgan, M. Hansten. Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute. University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.	n/a	Graduates show systematic and substantial increases in income, with some tail-off in the third year; graduates were only group to show this improvement; rates for using vocation services b drug courts are very low (2% in King and Pierce Cos; 4% in Spokane Co.) Graduates had highest rate of use of Medicaid;
29	December 2004	<i>Evaluation of Virginia's Drug Treatment Court Programs.</i> Office of the Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia	n/a	Virginia adult drug courts have treatment retention rate (active participants plus graduates) of 62.25%; Virginia's adult drug court participants are chronic offenders prior to drug court entry; averaging 6.8 felony arrests and 5.6 misdemeanor arrests.